

**DEIS-APPENDIX 9**  
**PUBLIC SCOPING COMMENTS**  
**NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENTS,**  
**DELONG MOUNTAIN TERMINAL, ALASKA**

**PUBLIC SCOPING COMMENTS**  
**NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENTS,**  
**DELONG MOUNTAIN TERMINAL, ALASKA**

This summary of scoping comments was prepared after public scoping meetings held at Kivalina, Noatak, Pt. Hope, and Kotzebue in the spring and summer of 2000. The comments are presented as they were recorded at those meetings. A copy of this summary was mailed to each participant who signed the attendance sheet at each meeting.

During those meetings, participants wanted to know whether their comments would be heard. In response to their concerns, the completed text of those scoping comments is presented in this appendix.

Scoping Report  
Delong Mt. Terminal (Portsite)  
Environmental Impact Statement  
July 31, 2000

What is Scoping? The Alaska District, Corps of Engineers (the Corps) is going to prepare a feasibility report and environmental impact statement (EIS) for expansion of the Delong Mountain Terminal at the location locally known as Portsite, about 57 miles northeast of Kotzebue. Each study the Corps of Engineers does for a project begins with scoping. The scope of a study defines the things that will be studied and the questions that will be answered in the study. The scope often begins with a list of comments and notes collected from interested people and agencies. Scoping is the process of hearing what people say about a study or a project and then using that information to decide what should be studied and what questions should be answered in the Corps' EIS and report.

What Has Been Done? The Alaska District Corps of Engineers and the State of Alaska signed an agreement in January 2000 to study expansion of the DeLong Mountain Terminal. We received a little funding in early February to start setting up the study. We received the first money from the State of Alaska on February 29th, which paid for visits to Noatak, Kotzebue, and Kivalina on March 3 to ask about the best way and time to meet to hear scoping questions and concerns. A Notice of Intent was published in the Federal Register on March 10, 2000. That publication allowed us to begin public scoping meetings.

We held scoping meetings at Noatak, Kotzebue, and Kivalina in late March. We also interviewed individual hunters, elected officers of the villages, and other interested persons. We held another meeting at Point Hope on May 24th and talked with Point Hope elders at lunch on May 25th. Comments at each meeting were recorded with a broad marker on large sheets of paper, which were posted so everyone could see the recorded comments and questions. After each comment or question was recorded, the commenter was asked to verify that the comment was recorded correctly. During the introduction for each meeting, the EIS and scoping processes were discussed. People attending each meeting were told that we would send them a summary of the scoping comments.

What Was Said at the Scoping Meetings? Comments and questions recorded at each meeting were transcribed directly from the large-format sheets. The recorder attempted to maintain the flow of the meeting, and in doing so, omitted some words and made grammatical errors. Recorded information is altered slightly in some of the statements to

correct those errors. Any remaining errors should be considered the responsibility of the recorder rather than the speaker. Comments were recorded as follows:

Public Scoping Meeting  
Kivalina, Alaska  
July 19, 2000

1. City of Kivalina passed a resolution opposing expansion of Portsite loading facility.
2. City was concerned about dredging and noise and how it would affect migration of all sea mammals.
3. Kivalina wants to speak for itself about its needs and effects on lifestyle.
4. Kivalina should have been included in Kotzebue economic development summit.
5. Kivalina should not have been excluded from the economic development conference.
6. Need good development in the region. Need good planning. Need to think of our children. Need good management.
7. Main concern is “prime time” April, May, June – for subsistence.
8. Want more accurate, honest studies. Previous studies were inadequate.
9. What about subsistence? What will be the impacts of the project on subsistence animals (marine and land) and our ability to hunt them.
10. If development drives away subsistence animals, (oogruk, bowhead, beluga) it will affect Kivalina and other coastal subsistence communities. It will cost more to go farther.
11. EIS should contain comments from everyone, including other villages and subsistence committees, local governing bodies.
12. EIS should cover everything that will impact or affect subsistence.
13. Do we want expansion at the expense of the subsistence way of life?

Kivalina, July 19, 2000

14. When the mine is gone, hope the same animals will be on the land and in the ocean. Which do we want? The mine or the animals?

15. We could have both development and animals, but the study should be convincing that the project would not impact the subsistence way of life.
16. Oogruk and beluga hunting occurs only for a month or two. Beluga don't go past portsite every year.
17. Economy of Kivalina is moving toward money. Would not support study and project if it would impact subsistence.
18. Hunted beluga this year April through June and Oogruk May through early July.
19. Native foods are to Natives as bank accounts are to urbanites. That's why they are so adamant about protecting the subsistence way of life.
20. If expansion goes ahead, and if it damages the habitat of subsistence resources, and drives them away and then mine closes, then we will have neither jobs nor subsistence resources.
21. Our children will be affected and their lives will be changed by decisions we make now.
22. Catches from hunting during 1 or 2 months are stored and are used year round. They support people all year.
23. Belugas don't go through the area every year, so a 1-year study is inadequate.
24. Portsite area is my grandparents' traditional hunting ground, which means there was something there they were hunting.
25. The notice of intent talked about Portsite as a regional hub. There were promises earlier about cheap fuel and freight.
  - a. Oppose this use.
  - b. Would this take business away from Kotzebue (Answer this in the EIS).
26. Concerned about regional development and roads that could follow expansion. Worried about effects on children. Could bring in bad influences.
27. In Kotzebue, there was a slide show for the development summit. It showed the conveyor for portsite.
28. Animals hear what is being said. Be careful what you talk about.  
Kivalina, July 19, 2000
29. No choice - have to talk about animals.

30. Children have a chance to go to work but have problems that keep them working at the mine. Problems from their own personal choices.
31. We have no choice but to discuss the animals we subsist on. This meeting leaves us with no option but to talk about subsistence animals and the subsistence way of life.
32. Fish in Wulik River migrate out in early June and back in early August.
33. Will disturbance from the project alter ocean floor and affect migrating fish and other animals?
34. Mine has permanently damaged the Wulik River. We can see the colors in the water. Wulik River used to crystal clear.
35. What is purpose of meeting? How will comments be used?
36. Extensive / comprehensive studies need to be done.

<b>Animals</b>	<b>Feed</b>	<b>Migration Patterns</b>	<b>Length of study</b>
Ugruk	Shrimp bottom sealife?	Mar-July	3-5 years
Bowhead	Plankton sealife?	Mar-June Fall	5 years
Trout	Bugs smaller fish?	June Fall	3-5 years
Beluga	Small fish shrimp?	Mar-July Fall	3-5 years

37. Need to talk to captains about subsistence take.
38. Need to talk to each of 72 homes in Kivalina. Should find out what every household catches year-round. We recommended this a year or two ago. Ask about before and after Portsites.
39. We depend upon hunter and on subsistence in addition to salary. Even though we may be employed, we can't buy chicken or beef every day.
40. It is almost a given that there would be dredging every summer.
41. Expansion of portsite means more production more waste, more spills, more seepage, and more air pollution. What will they do with the tailings pond when the mine closes? There is potential for loss of water and subsistence resources. They don't have the capability to manage their operation. They can't manage larger production. Why do they want to expand? They are making lots of profit now.  
Kivalina, July 19, 2000
42. Kivalina is not getting the jobs that were promised 15 years ago.

43. What other options are there for transporting ore from the mine.
44. If channel is dredged every year, where will money come from? Will it affect the community?
45. How much does Cominco get fined each year? Maybe more than is spent on the mine itself. The community could get some of that money.
46. We do not trust Cominco to monitor itself for compliance.
47. Kivalina is uniquely situated. Village subsistence resources are affected by run off into the Wulik River on one side and by the haul road and Portsite on the other. Village comments should be given more weight than comments from other places farther away.
48. Cumulative impacts of all development plans for the region that are dependent upon expansion should be studied, including impacts on caribou migration.

Other written comments following the meeting:

1. Favor Red Dog Port expansion. Believe that development of resources and subsistence activities can work together.
2. Concerned about subsistence hunting areas at Portsite during prime time hunting (April, May, and June). Concerns include noise levels, activities during the prime hunting times, and effects of the dredging.
3. Kids will probably never go back to the old ways of dog mushing and paddling for sea mammals. They like to use fast boats, snowmachines and ATV's, and need guns, ammunition, fuel, etc. to hunt. Red Dog can provide cash for those needs for hunting.

Public Scoping Meeting  
Point Hope, Alaska  
May 24, 2000

1. Object to Cape Thompson and Cape Lisburne--not done with cleanup. Point Hope relies on subsistence from ocean and the land.
2. Should bring the people of Noatak, Kivalina, Point Hope, and Kotzebue to meet about this.
3. Should answer questions in Kivalina IRA letter.
4. Support comments from Noatak and Kivalina.
5. Other villages should share in mine revenues, including Shishmaref and Point Hope.
6. EIS should address effects of zinc contamination in subsistence animals. Include Canadian studies on zinc in foods.
7. In 1986, the Boundary Commission detached some NSB land and included them in Northwest Arctic Borough without including all Point Hope comments.
8. In 1990, state reported lead blood test results from women and children. No further testing for lead has been conducted. 1990 tests showed early signs warning of lead poisoning (anemia). All state has is a baseline.
9. Has any Village IRA used Title 8 of ANILCA to protect their subsistence resources?
10. Is expanding Portsite being proposed to take care of contamination as was done by AIDEA to fix problem at Skagway (gross lead contamination in dock)?
11. There have been 2 different sets of environmental violations at Red Dog that have resulted in compromises. Will violations and compromises continue?
12. Why have more blood tests not been done at Point Hope?
13. Object to expanding port. A zinc or oil spill would affect Point Hopes' subsistence animals.
14. Change name of mine. Close mine down. It is dangerous. There are other ways to help people of the region.



Point Hope, May 24, 2000

15. What minerals that are extracted from the mine?
  - a) zinc
  - b) lead
  - c) What others?
16. Reference the NANA/Cominco operation subsistence committee agreement. Point Hope should be included in the subsistence committee.
17. How much would shipping traffic increase with the expansion?
18. Expansion could lead to extraction of minerals from other deposits in the region. This compares to a promises made about benefits of a deepwater port made 40 years ago for Project Chariot.
19. People from Kivalina and Noatak should work at the project and report back to their people, if the project goes through.
20. What route will ships take through the Bering Straits? Shipping will affect resources all along the Alaska coast.
21. Would operation maintenance affect water quality?
22. Would food for birds be affected?
23. How long would dredge sediment remain suspended?
24. Where will suspended sediments go?
25. Will they (sediments) affect marine animals and water quality all the way to Point Hope?
26. Should include other villages: Buckland, Kiana, Candle, and Kotzebue, - 13 villages or societies (including Kotzebue commercial fishermen association) in public hearings and other activities.
27. If everything remains the same, Red Dog will mine and export 29% of U.S. zinc reserves. Two other deposits near Red Dog will support fifty years of mining and export each. Why are those deposits NANA's rather than A.S.R.C?
28. Point Hope should claim the deposits and mine them in a cleaner manner.

Point Hope, May 24, 2000

29. Animals used in subsistence are contaminated by materials from Japan, Russia, and Lower 48. Red Dog is contributing to that contamination.
30. Concerned that material to be dredged may be contaminated and might be released to affect coastal ecology and animals in food chain.
31. Concerned about lead. Yearly screening should be done for lead.
32. Our way of life is more important than money or economic development.
33. Predominant currents run to the north—how will sediment from dredging affect Point Hope?
34. Caribou coming from south are sicklier than caribou from north.
35. Since construction of Portsite, beluga distribution and hunting have changed. Now, Point Hope doesn't harvest beluga after ugruk season.
36. (I am )Seeing rainbow color in meat, indicating contamination.
37. Why was Portsite built where it was?
38. Could it be built farther south?
39. Whales and other marine mammals are further out since construction of current Portsite. Would expansion of Portsite make them go even farther out?
40. Hunters report dead caribou this winter north of Red Dog development, but not to the south. Are caribou dying because of Red Dog dust in the air?
41. Subsistence resources cannot be replaced by federal or state government if they are lost. People of Point Hope must protect them.
42. What is consensus of Point Hope community regarding Portsite expansion?
43. Was Kivalina included in original development of Red Dog?
44. Animals migration routes changed within a year after Red Dog was developed.
45. Last few years, some ugruks have rusty color heads and bald spots. Could this have been caused by Red Dog?

Point Hope, May 24, 2000

46. Has Native Village of Kivalina passed an environmental ordinance?
47. There should be a meeting of NANA, ASRC, IRA's subsistence advisory committees, and state representatives and Cominco.
48. Do not need to add to cancer incidence in Point Hope.
49. Can't the existing port do the job without expansion?
50. Is mine road traffic stopping for caribou?
51. Can minerals be taken out by not going through ocean?
52. Concern expressed about chemicals in subsistence diet.
53. More dead caribou between Red Dog and Point Hope than farther south or farther north. Why?

RED DOG MINE SUMMIT: Several commentators stated that the people of the region need to get together to talk about mining in the region, including how mining should be done, who should control it, and who should share in the benefits.

Public Scoping Meeting  
Kivalina, Alaska  
March 29, 2000

1. How much dredging every year?
2. Only place village hunts oogruk there.
3. Before Portsie beluga's came past Kivalina every summer.
4. Oogruk were farther out last year. Would take about five per family if they could.
5. Expensive to dredge the channel every summer.
6. Dredging should be timed for after hunting.
7. Currents are stronger in the fall.
8. Where would dredged material go?
9. If oogruk are lost because of project, Kivalina will have a hard time.
10. Project should give village other food or money if oogruk is lost at Portsie.
11. How much noise does ice make from the dock now?
12. When belugas are coming, study by stopping noise at Portsie to see if beluga go by to Kivalina. Late June-early July.
13. Traditional knowledge – Whales can hear noise more than 5 miles away.
14. Wait dredging until after beluga pass.

Public Scoping Meeting  
Kotzebue, Alaska  
March 28, 2000

1. Could a channel be dredged to the existing loading facility?
2. Concerned about noise from a dock and its effects on marine mammals.
3. Noise from loading, other mechanical noise, ice noise.
4. How many bottom habitats would be affected directly by dredging vs. ore loss?
5. How would a corridor caused by dredging affect habitat use on both sides?
6. How far on both sides?
7. How will we predict those effects?
8. Need to consider environmental trade-offs of dredging closer to shore to reduce conveyor length and ore loss.
9. Could vacuum or other technology be used to load ore with less loss?
10. Look at bottom at existing loading facility for contamination.
11. Compare habitat, and habitat functions and values, at various distances off shore. Use this information to help determine whether it would be better to put the loading facility farther off-shore or bring the channel into deeper water.
12. How much maintenance dredging?
13. How often?
14. How much noise does dredging make underwater?
15. How far away could marine mammals hear it?
16. When would channel be dredged?
17. When do trout and salmon migrate through the Ports site area?
18. Effects on migrating fish.
19. Look at effect of Ports site project on mining and other activities (and their impacts).

Kotzebue, March 28, 2000

20. Cumulative and induced impacts.
21. Does tailings pond get bigger if production increases?
22. Potential for increased regional mining and production.
23. What are effects on Noatak, Kivalina, and Kotzebue of a regional hub at Portsited?
24. What about connecting Kivalina and Noatak to Portsited by road?
25. Hunters will be displaced?
26. How will effects on hunters be mitigated?
27. Part of Portsited revenues should go to Kotzebue, Kivalina, and Noatak as compensation for subsistence losses.
28. Effects of a new regional hub on Kotzebue commerce and economics.
29. What are environmental and economic pros and cons for the region?
30. What is the environmental baseline for the EIS?
31. Use pre-Cominco condition to help evaluate cumulative impacts.
32. Existing project has displaced belugas. Noise from Portsited makes them go farther out.
33. What effects will late shipping have on whaling in other villages outside the Portsited area -- Nome and south (fall hunting?)
34. Would a new facility load more ore than is being loaded now?
35. How much more fugitive dust would come from a bigger, longer conveyor?
36. Air and water contamination—how much now? How much with bigger facility?
37. Will there be a contingency plan for a major loss of ore in water?
38. Potential for ballast water to introduce exotic species.

Public Scoping Meeting  
Noatak, Alaska  
March 27, 2000

1. Oil spill 1988 – Was it cleaned up?
2. Existing dock – animals are farther out.
3. A longer dock will make animals go farther out.
4. Presence of a foreign object causes change. (My note: The presence of the existing dock affects movements, distribution, feeding, and other activities of marine mammals and the things they eat. This goes beyond the often-stated concerns about noise and states the concern that the mere presence, even without noise or other stimuli, is recognized by marine life and affects their activity and their ability to function.)
5. Was data collected for existing dock?
6. Would animals move farther out with a new dock? Or does noise already push them out?
7. Important that shipping is delayed until after ice is out and hunting is done.
8. What are effects of dredging on mammals that use the area and people who harvest them?
9. Bottom material that would be dredged should be tested for toxic contaminants.
10. How would the Portsite expansion benefit all the villages of the region?
11. If fuel is shipped to Portsite, how will it get to Noatak and other villages?
12. Who would pay for costs of shipping fuel?

What other comments and issues have been identified during the scoping process?

1. Potential for collision or other impact to migratory birds.
2. How much would expansion of Ports site affect regional development?
3. Could some of the dredged material be used for roads or other on-land construction?
4. What on-land disposal sites could be used instead of deep-water disposal?
5. Would the dredged channel cause a offshore rip during storm events?
6. Are global or broad ecosystem events affecting populations, distribution, and movement of important marine mammals, and if so, how do we separate those impacts from effects of Ports site.
7. Have hunting or other human activities changed marine mammal distribution or movement in the region, and if so, how do we separate those changes from effects of Ports site.
8. What range of alternatives is possible? Could the facilities be shifted up or down the coast? Could the channel be dredged into shallow enough water so that the loading facility would be entirely in shore-fast ice?
9. Many people believe that the Red Dog mine is causing pollution that is not being reported and/or that has not been cleaned up. That suspicion is displayed in numerous comments about trust, potential for contamination from increased operations, and concern over reliability of data to be collected.
10. There is concern that marine mammals and other traditional foodstuffs are contaminated by global pollution and are causing cancer and other medical effects in Native users. There is concern that any contamination from ore loading would add to that contaminant load and its effects.
11. People of the region want to be involved in environmental studies for the project so they can contribute their knowledge and can see what is being done.
12. The same groups of oogruck and beluga may return to Ports site each year, or the oogruck and/or beluga at Ports site may be part of a population that ranges over a broad area. This has management and impact implications.
13. The area around and south of Ports site often is identified, particularly by hunters from Kivalina and Kotzebue, as a place frequented by oogruck and other seals. Can this be confirmed by field observations? If there are more seals there, then why? Is



What other comments and issues have been identified during the scoping process?

it because of better feeding opportunities, more persistent ice leads, or some other factor? What are marine mammals eating there (there are numerous reports of oogrük stomachs containing shrimp or shrimp and crab).? If feeding opportunities are attracting oogrük, then what effect would Portsite expansion have on food organisms used by oogrük and other seals?

14. Would the facility affect near-shore navigation by small boats (would boats have to go out around the loading facility)?